9/23/71

Dear Miss Gonzalez,

If I didn't tell you earlier, I hope you will pardon the seeming impoliteness of my not taking time to correct my errible typing. I do too much work, can't keep up with what I should and the alternative to inflicting these errors on those to whom I write is working less or answering fewer letters. As I approach 59, I am finnaly permitting myself the luxury of almost 6 hours a night's sleep most nights. The rest is work. I do know how bad my typing is, how much worse it is when I rush, and I am sorry.

I read your letter of the 18th, which arrived today, when the mail came this a.m. I'll probably skim it again before I close.

First of all, please let me know what you tell me you want held in confidence. While I have come to the point, with all the irresponsibles and marginal paranoids and real ones styling themselves "critics", that I generally pass nothing on save on the spook basis of need to know, there are several things on which I might seek the estimates of some of the few others with whom I work, But without your assent, I think I should not. Until I hear otherwise from you, I will regard what you have told me of your own work as confidential. I encourage you to adopt the same attitude. You will learn if you do not that some of those you consider dependable really are not. If you do not want your material used, and I think you should not want it used, if you share much of it with some whose names you've used, you may find, if they find it useful, that their names may be above it and the possibility of carrying your work forward may be dim nished or made impossible.

From the time I saw Nizer given as a NY Kaplan lawyer, I began to wonder if his puerile defense, if that is what it was, of the Warren Commission, had no more to do with special interest than the fact that he takes cases before the Supreme Court. To call him no more than s snake is to defame Eve's serpent. Is it possible that he is one of the many lawyers the CIA has stached away around the land? Could he represent more than the Kaplan family? If he represents the fund, doe that include the agency?

Bay of Pigs: it was no secret. The exact point of the landing may have been, I realize, in question, but the fact of the coming evasion was secret from Americans only. From what I have seen of the exiles, it would have been no Castro intelligence coup to know all. Besides, unless he served some vital function in that abortion, and I can conceiveof none, it is not likely the blanco spooks would have told Kaplan. He might have learned from the Cubans, but I think it more likely that this is either deliberate self-inflation or confabulation. Which brings me to a central point. You seem to have seen him often. If you would care to practise amateur psychiatry, what is your estimate? Some psychiatric conditions lend themselves to int lligence functions. Paranoids are more security conscious. Those with a tendency toward self-destruction can be more daring, etc. Nothing you have said indicates anybreal role for him in the bay of Pigs invasion, unless there was a Mexican liaison of some kind needed, and if that were the case, even now, unless he had been abandoned completely by the agency, which the spectacular rescue does not persaude, I can't imagine him talking. Unless he is sick. Besides, I consider it an over-simplification to consider that the bat of Pigs was causative.

You mention JFK saying he'd take the Agency apart and scatter it to the four winds. That, I believe, had to do with the final double-cross, the Bargboorn case, where he was lied to. He knew about the Bay of Pigs from the interregnum, when he was told while he was at Palm Beach. I think you should understand that there were two JFKs, that he changed in his last year, very much. His hangup was that he had not agreed to commit any US forces, like air. They tried to commit him to it. Dulles, ultimately, tried to blackmail him into agreement. The CIA has done some pretty wierd stuff, but I can't imagine them really believing that ragtag bunch could take an empty department store. I think they wanted that operation to committ the US deeply, and that is where JFK drew the line.

For whatever it is worth to you, correspondent for Ramparts or not, I caution you not to take Turner's word for anything without independent confirmation and he is, on the subject of the assassination, having done nothing but lay eggs himself, a literary klepto aniac. I've lived through it. His judgement is incredibly bad. He took a pair of agents to Garrison, with no basis at all endorsed them, etc. I happened

to be in on part of it by accident, twice. One night one of Jim's men asked me to joing him for supper, which I'd already eaten, and he drove me to where they had this dinner going, in the Quarter. It then seemed like Turner was the host. There was this strange pair of young people there, the girl rather hard faced and shortly-clad, which was a bit ahead of times in that part of early 68. And the next morning, when I went into Jim's office for something, they were showing some real sick stuff on 16mm, which seems to have been intended as a second Park Lane cinema classic. Terrible crap. Disgrace to a decent toilet. It later turned out that Turner had no basis at all for giving this pair a character, as he apparently did to Jim. My source on the characterization is himself dubious. Vince Salandria, who is perhaps a bit more paranoid than Garrison. But of one thing there is no doubt: that entire Nancy Perrin Rich-N.O.-Boxley-Turner bit was fiction. I can't evaluate her testimony about Dallas, but it has to be earlier than most people believe, because thereafter she moved to and then around in N.O. and Perrin died there in about 7/62. (The colonel in her story could not have been Castorr, who I have come to know well.) With no more than the venom of extremists of the right extreme to go on, B and T had a team where one would backstop the other's "investigation", all of which were non-existent or worse, manufactures. I can't go into that, but I will never recover from what it cost me to keep that insanity from being pulled to commenorate the assassination in '68. I have a fairly complete file, what I put out on paper only. What I did, said, etc., I've had beither need nor time to commit to paper. But my recollections are painfully sharp. That Boxley was in any way CIA is Jim's invention to save his own face. I suspect he and Turner were busily engaged in making out the case Jim decided had to be. They are all that way. It would take a half-day of talking just to tell you that zany thing. But my point is, watch out. Whether or not there is an assassination connection, there is a probably profitable and certaibly useful book in Kaplan, and there is no reason for you to share it, voluntarily or involuntarily. I do wish we could get together, but that seems unlikely. The only time I can now travel is when I'm paid to speak, and I don't know a dozen words od Spanish. Should you ever be able to come here, we do have accomodations. You'd be welcome.

Garrison on a Senate investigation: the safest assumption, tragically, with Jim, is to assume that only error is original with him. The call for a Senate investigation, so far as he is concerned, originates with me, from my forst book and out later conversations. Perhaps you reminded him. But he and I had long talks about it, going back to the end of 4/67. It is the conclusion of my first book. On the Kennedys, it is I who stopped him form keeping after Bobby, one of the few things on which I could influence him after he had made his mind up. That was about 11/67.

Turner fed you rubbish about the almost-mutiny in the staff. That was Turner's fault, and it was over charging Bradley by phone, from L.A. They called me. I had been in N.O., then on a trip that ended in L.A., where I left Jim. Tragically, and typically, I left L.A. in haste, without completing the work I planned, because Sciambra was supposed to be coming up here. He didn't then, didn't even let me know, and in our rush to get ready here at home my wife sprained her ankle. Alcock almost quit over it. The only real protestover that nonsense of CIA penetration was by me, to Alcock and Sciambra, while Salandria was still in N.O.(I'd taken him there to reach Jim, who says day is night if I say day, on the correct, as it turned out, theory that it takes a paranoid to reach a paranoid. We finally got Vince on the plane and out of N.O., or there would have been a real revolt. He was beyond belief!). I figured Boxley was no more than sick and doing Jim's bidding, and I saw no reasone to give him more troubles on the basis of nothing at all. I did all the work that broke that mess up, not the staff. And while Alcock and Sciambra were sympathetic to my argument and Boxley's plight, what had just happened to Jim was such a blow, they would not take his one crumb, that press release, away from him. It was, indeed, a terrible blow to that ego. Turner is the last person to be disillusioned. He was the largest single waste of time, diversion and cause of the waste of money of all, as I'll tell you if it ever serves a purpose. Just remind me of Rose/Farewell America. I repeat, watch your collague. From what I've seen of him, I can believe Hoover fired him for incompetence. And I can give you chapter and verse.

I'm aware of the kind of self-portrait you can take from what I'm telling you. But you make up your own mind. I'm telling it to you as it is as I see it, and I think you'll have no doubt believing me if you have occasion to see my files. And with all I'm into, without time for what is important to our private lives or enough time for work, long ago I abandoned the effort at diplomacy and the little extra time it takes. Jim is not fond of me for a number of reasons, one being that I did and could do in his turf what he and his couldn't, another is because I don't think men's asses are for men's kissing (and would kowtow to him and tell him how great he was), and another is the worst vice, being right and calling the shots. Loves those who fawn and listen. I stayed away from him to the degree I could and worked. God knows he was doing no real work in N.O. and somebody had to. If I didn't begin to get the job done, I did what he/they didn't/ I never hear from him. Infrequently I hear from others when they need help I can and do provide, including on the current mess, where they've not seen what I have. I expect one here soon.

The Senators were afraid, Fulbright was other then than you now evaluate him, and the tough ones, like Morse, thought Bobby was privy to everything and if he was satisfied they felt they had no reason not to be. Nobody is going to charge me with anything until there is some extremity that makes the cost, calling attention to everything I've done, worth it, and that time has not come. Meanwhile, I am on the aggressive, making charges all the time, against them, in writing and in court. My FRAME-UP really clobbers Hoover. He doesn't want any attention called to it. Ditto for Rheindienst and Mitchell, etc. One a <u>really</u> full-field auditing of our books by Internal Revenue, where unlike Jim, I turned everything over, the agent finished with a high opinion of my wife and me and we got a small refund! We keep full and straight books. We can stand investigation.

You are right in saying that the pattern doesn't connect K with the killing. He was in jail, then and when LHO was in Mexico. Did you ever pick up anything on that?

Reason for the Bay of Pigs failure: rubbish. It couldn't have succeeded, I think was designed to get us involved, not succeed, and I can't believe the CIA really believed the people would rise up. Unless they did, no invasion anywhere could have succeeded. Picking so bad a place makes me wonder if failure wasn't the design. I've address the tearing apart of the CIA. I don't know what is involved in the Vidal murder, but can't believe it was connected with the assassination. I don't know your unidentified source, but I dispute and don't believe. Did Vidal know of the Bay Pigs <u>beforehand?</u> On this you do not quote K. I do not pry, but you do not identify the N.Y. attorney who used to visit Kaplan, so I can't evaluate him as a source. Nizer's is a large office, by the way. Nor can I evaluate Vidal in any Bay Pigs, the real one or any planned later one (which I can't believe had JFK's ok). Guns: the CIA doesn't need any. They have plenty. So Vidal is not working for them with Enfields, which are good but less effecient than available. They are old and slow. You have only to read the UN debates, as I have, to know there was no such tipoff. Besides, the consummate stupidity of the B-26 that landed at Key West blew it all over again, and that was reported in the U.S.

I know nothing of Ferreire Bros. or Fibrelite. But I've no reason not to believe they could have been a N.O. cover operation. If you know anything you'd like me to evaluate, ask. No males of this name are in the 12/67 N.O. phone book. But Fibrelite is, at Vacherie, La., with a N.O. (french Quarter general area) number. K didn't have to know anything to tell you the Warren Report is full of holes. You give no reason to connect Ruby and Vidal. Nancy's testimony doesn't. But if Ruby was in Guadalajara, with any Genovese, that would be interesting (and this is not Vidal or Perrin). I'm not aware of syndicate anger over lost Cuban narcotics business, don't dispute, but go into gambling through McLaney in ~~xxxxxxxx~~ OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS.

When you address K's role in the assassination, hsi "knowing too much" doesnot give him any role. And what he knew, if anything, that relates to the assassination and was not public you do not say....There is a fascinating story of Chep Morrison and

his I think strange death, another writer's story. I've done no work on it. He is to.

Sorry I can't help on Koppelsohn. Sound intriguing.

I don't think from what you've said that you need know anything about sugar diplomacy or the mob, of which I also know little. I think you may be getting lost in the dubious where the real is great copy. If you tell the unquestioned story straight and right, you can offer, for what it is worth, without endorsing it, what you have beenttold. But someone should read that latter parts for you, somone who can evaluate. If personal ego damage is one of the reasons you hesitate tackling this alone, I do not see any reason from what you've said. Did you tape any of your interviews, by the way? Or transcribe? The other things are the norms of the spook business or what is, I think, at best peripheral. At least on the basis of what you've said.

Your chances of getting a publisher are less with any assassination line essential to your story. Why not see what you have without it, which I consider a likely book, and then see if you have enough on the assassination to warrant inclusion of what you say you can't vouch for but have been told? You have a good CIA story, but I see nothing that has meaning on the assassination(s). If Kaplan gives you the promised "script" , I tell you frankly I'll not believe it unless, on reading, it makes sense. Others who served CIA roles on Mexico and without dependability. Some were plain blabberouths (Turned planted on on Garrison), some hardly normal.

But you say this ties in with the assassination. Not with what you've told me. This is my answer to your question, have you related the two cases.

Do you have a US agent? If you do not, would you consider a Mexican publisher if he would finance your further inquiries? If you do not have a U.S. agent, how will you deal with what publishers? They are all crooks anyway.

One of the redeeming features of what I know of this case as it relates to publishability is that it is not, as the CIA and publishers would see it, anti-CIA. If their boy was innocent, are they not good guys to rescue him? And that there are CIA agents or various kinds and categories is no longer regarded as a state secret. I don't think you'd write a pro-CIA book, but they might not take the straight Kpalan story as unfavorable to them and there seems to be no reason why a publisher should with all the attention it has gotten. Your first-person stuff to add couldbe more than enough.

I will not always take this time. I do because I think you have something and do not think you have what you seem to think you do. Why do you not do what you really do have? Of your sources, all that I could consider dependable is the Mexican lawyer, and all he said came from K, so you have given me no single source I'd trust. Certainly not Garrison or Turner, who Iknown to well. They go for anything and make up the missing voids. I've seen it to often. By the way, I've clipped the U.S. papers to the degree I have been able to on the escape. The NYTimes service had a good one, with direct quotes of family and lawyers. Do you need? Can have.

I call all women who do not say they are married "Miss", so if you are married, I intend taking no liberties. I do hope you can sort all of this out in your own mind, disassociate what is dubious and decide whether you have a book with the remainder. And please believe me, what I've told you that you may not find congenial about people is right. As it is about any connection wihh the assassination. You've shown me nothing I can tell myself stands up on that.

Whatever you decide, good luck. It could make a great story. If you don't have pix, why not try and get? Have you interviewed the Mexican wife? She might have some fine ehhmalz, that is, human-interest stuff.

Best regards,